Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

only to lapsed and not to void legacies. Shaw and Sloss, JJ., *dissenting*. *In re Matthews' Estate* (1917, Cal.) 169 Pac. 233.

Under similar statutes the prevailing view allows the descendant of a legatee dead when the will was made to take the bequest. *Lewis v. Corbin* (1907) 195 Mass. 520, 81 N. E. 248; *contra, Lindsay v. Pleasants* (1846) 39 N. C. 320. But even if one accepts the minority view as to the construction of such statutes, it is difficult to support the court's application of the doctrine of republication in the principal case. This doctrine should be applied to effectuate not to defeat the testator's intentions. See *Izard v. Hurst* (1697, Ir. Ch.) 2 Freem. 223 (adeemed legacy not revived); *Gurney v. Gurney* (1855, Eng. V. C.) 3 Drew. 208 (legacy to witness not rendered void); *In re McCauley's Estate* (1903) 138 Cal. 432, 71 Pac. 512 (legacy to charity not made illegal).

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—WHO IS AN EMPLOYEE—OFFICER OF CORPORATION.—The claimant received $50 per week for his services as secretary-treasurer of respondent corporation as well as salesman and collector of its accounts. He sustained an injury while acting in the latter capacity. He was also one of the three stockholders of the corporation. *Held*, that the mere fact that he was an officer and stockholder did not exclude him from the benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Act. *In re Raynes* (1917, Ind.) 118 N. E. 387.

On a somewhat similar state of facts the New York Court of Appeals held that the majority stockholder and president of a corporation, whose salary was $70 per week, was not an employee within the meaning of the Workmen's Compensation Act. *Bowne v. S. W. Bowne & Co.* (1917) 221 N. Y. 28, 116 N. E. 364, discussed in 27 YALE LAW JOURNAL, 284. The principal case approves but distinguishes this decision. The court declares that there is no single decisive test which can be applied to the problem as to what sort of employee is entitled to compensation. The solution depends on a consideration of all the facts in each particular case, regard being had to the purposes of the legislation.